UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

Duty to Civilization (*Part VII*)

By FRANCIS NEILSON

Henrik Ibsen

By GEORGE WILLIS COOKE

A Modern German Leader

By CHARLES W. WENDTE

VOLUME LXXXVII NUMBER 19

Chicago, July 7, 1921

PUBLISHED BI-WEEKLY

UNITY

ESTABLISHED 1878

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE
Pamphlet Mission
FOR
FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER
IN
RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:
Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Frances L. Roberts, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Contents:

EDITORIAL—
Notes.—J. H. H. 291
Duty to Civilization, Part VII.—Francis Neilson 293

CONTRIBUTED—
Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature. VII. Henrik Ibsen.—George Willis Cooke 297
Youth.—Samuel Ullman 299
A Mountain Interlude.—Brent Dow Allinson 300
A Modern German Leader.—Charles W. Wendte 300

SELECTED—
Pacific Peace.—*Rev. Sidney Strong* 301

CORRESPONDENCE—
A Suggestion for Hopefulness.—Lydia G. Wentworth .. 302

POETRY—
Wait in Joy.—*Anna Catherine Markham* 291
The Toilers.—Dombey 299
To an Oriole.—*Edgar Fawcett* 301

THE FIELD—
The Creed of the Friends 303

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXVII THURSDAY, JULY 7, 1921 NUMBER 19

WAIT IN JOY.

Do your dull days give scope for no great act?
Build them a lovely dream out-shining fact.
Be beautiful and strong, until the hour
That brings high use for your out pouring power.

The rainbowed waterfall upon the hill
Becomes the valley stream that turns the mill

Nautilus. —*Anna Catherine Markham.*

Following the plan adopted last year, from this date on UNITY will appear once every fortnight through the months of July, August and September. Many of our readers expressed approval of our efforts to economize a year ago and we feel sure will gladly co-operate once again, and we also feel sure that the high quality of our recent issues will indicate the purpose of UNITY's editors to keep faith with its growing circle of readers. EDS.

The Harding administration has now been in office for four months, and no achievements of constructive policy on the great questions of the day have yet appeared at this writing (June 28th). The President told us during his campaign that, if elected, he would lose not a moment in ending the status of war with Germany; but summer is at hand and we are still technically engaged in hostilities with the enemy. The President promised that he would seek an association of nations, relieved of the elements which made the League of Nations so abhorrent, which would start a new and genuine movement of international organization to the end of peace; but no step has yet been taken in this direction. The whole country clamors for effective action on behalf of disarmament, and stricken Europe yearns for this as for nothing else in the world; but every proposal yet made has been received either with disfavor or equivocation by the White House. In the matter of Soviet Russia, the administration at the worst repeats the mistakes of Woodrow Wilson, and at the best is content to drift. Toward Mexico the mail fist is shaken, and the chains in Haiti and San Domingo clank anew. Is nothing to be hoped from President Harding and his advisers save an amiable desire to please as many and displease as few men as possible? We are evidently in the ruts, and we see no escape in the near future.

Hamilton Holt undoubtedly had these facts in mind, when he wrote his open letter to the President, demanding that he do something in the matter of the "association of nations" that he has said so much about. Mr. Harding's record on this issue is anything but creditable. His party is frankly divided between those who would have America keep absolutely free of all foreign entanglements, and those who would have the nation do her share of the work of establishing some kind of international body for the maintenance of peace and order. The former group the President has placated by his declaration of opposition to the League of Nations; the later group he has encouraged by his talk about some kind of international association which would have none of the attributes of a "super-government" and yet would help to keep the peace. Mr. Holt now demands that Mr. Harding take some steps looking to the organization of this association. Words are all well enough; but meanwhile new occasions of war are constantly appearing, the piling up of armaments is proceeding on a scale hitherto unheard of, and disaster may thus come upon us before we are aware. There never was a time when a policy of "watchful waiting," as Wilson put it, or of "wait and see," to use the Asquith phrase, was more impossible than now. Unless something is done, says Mr. Holt to the President, "people will inevitably conclude that you have no concrete plan at all or else you propose to put party harmony above world welfare." We had supposed that everybody already knew that both these suppositions are true, but perhaps it is just as well to have them emphasized afresh.

If President Harding had in his mind any last lingering qualms about the League of Nations, for which he twice cast his senatorial vote (with Lodge reservations), these must have been effectively allayed by the recent confession of Lord Curzon that the League is a failure and may henceforth be dismissed from consideration. We admit that this statement by the English Foreign Secretary surprised us, for one of our reasons for opposing the League was the conviction that the Covenant betrayed all true international ideals by creating a body admirably adapted to the service of such imperialistic purposes as men of the Curzon type have long represented. But the machinery evidently doesn't work! Or else the old diplomatic ways are still best! At any rate, whenever any international business of any moment comes along, it is the ambassadors who act, and the Supreme Council which meets, confers and issues fiats. The League of Nations is as much "out of it" as though

it no longer existed! A hard-headed man like Lord Curzon sees this, admits it, and straightway adapts himself to the situation. It would be well for all of us to be realists to just this extent at least. If we want an international organization, we must begin anew. Nothing more is to be hoped for from the League. This is a wreck which will not even yield us salvage. All of which means, incidentally, that the way is wide open for President Harding!

Speaking of the League of Nations reminds us that it was two years ago at this time that the organization was launched. In celebration of the occasion, we read that a great crowd, numbering tens of thousands of people, assembled in Hyde Park, London. We fear that this gathering marked an impressive triumph of hope over experience. But even so, the event has a significance not to be missed. For if men and women are commemorating the League, it is because they believe in internationalism, are tired of wars and rumors of wars, yearn for peace, and that decent orderliness in relations between self-governing states which will mean tranquility and goodwill. How well it would be if the rulers of the world would only act upon these human aspirations and desires—determine their policies by the conviction that there is love in the hearts of men, and not merely hate and fear! What we lack everywhere at the present moment is "the will to believe" that mankind can be trusted, and that therefore it is safe to be kind. With this "will," as with God, "all things are possible." Without this "will," programs of disarmament, treaties of alliance, even leagues or associations of nations, are only so many "scraps of paper." Verily, brethren, there is divine truth in the golden sentence from William Morris's "Dream of John Bull"—"Fellowship is life, and lack of fellowship is death; fellowship is heaven, and lack of fellowship is hell; and the things which ye do upon the earth, it is for fellowship's sake that ye do them."

News comes to us from Italy of the sad plight of the people of Montenegro. The hideous work of the peacemakers at Versailles is reaping its awful harvest here as in the rest of Europe. "It is necessary to act at once," says a personal letter from Rome, signed by M. Guglielmo Lucidi, Mlle. Dr. Marie de Rusiecka, and M. Lucyan Bauman, "in order to save what remains of the little Montenegrin people, delivered without any restraint or protection to a barbarian who by his horrors recalls to us the inquisition of the Middle Ages. We send you a copy of *La Rassegna Internazionale* in which is an account of the hypocrisy and the machiavelianism of the great powers, of which these people are the victims. We, on our part, have interviewed people coming from this country who describe the horrors of the invasion of their country by the Serbians." This letter announces the organization of an International Committee for the Independence of Montenegro, and pleads with us "to raise (our) voice in favor of these unhappy people." We do so herewith, for America must carry her full share of responsibility for the tragedies of the Peace, and all Americans must do their utmost to repair this responsibility. What can be done in this country for the Montenegrins, we do not know—we must wait for further information from the International Committee which is now entering upon its work. But we would give assurance to our Italian friends that we sympathize with their appeal, and stand ready to do all we can to stir our people to action on behalf of the oppressed and forsaken. There seems to be no end to the misery and injustice now present in the world. Every day brings its own new tale of misery, starvation, pestilence and war. The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse still waste the world with terror!

The editor of *The Christian Herald* has been reading Dr. Kirby Page's book, "The Sword or the Cross," and is much impressed with its non-resistant argument. He says, "that the teaching of Jesus and also of his disciples was opposed to war, cannot be successfully questioned by anyone who reads the Gospel record." This seems to us to be as plain as a pike-staff, and yet how many were there who were willing to admit this fact from 1914 to 1918! Our memory is of a perfect avalanche of clergymen and religious editors rushing to prove that Jesus and his disciples were not only not opposed to war, but were actually in favor of it. Did not Jesus drive the money-changers from the temple? Did he not declare, "I bring not peace but a sword"? Did he not welcome Peter's disclosure of a sword at the Last Supper? These and others were the unanswerable (?) arguments for the militancy of the Master which were put forward in a thousand pulpits and seriously argued in a hundred religious journals. Now that the hysteria of the war is past and some measure of sanity has returned to our minds, we know that these arguments are bunkum, and that such usage of such texts was ignorant when it was not flatly and flagrantly dishonest. There is no imaginable means by which the sword and the cross can be reconciled. Nobody but a lunatic or a blood-dripping barbarian can picture the Nazarene thrusting a bayonet into the bowels of his enemy, or leveling poisonous gas at the ranks of his foes. The man who would walk in the footsteps of the Nazarene cannot follow the flag to the battlefield. Let that be written within our hearts in letters of fire, that it may flame forth in the dark days of the next war which may all too soon descend upon us.

A distinguished liberal clergyman of highest repute in his denomination who is serving successfully a church over which he has been settled for many years, is reported in a private letter as saying that "if all the churches in the country were burned or destroyed and for five years people were compelled to worship in theatres, it would do more to eliminate creeds and narrowness than any other means could accomplish in many more years." This sounds like a cruel statement, but we believe it to be absolutely sound. The destruction of many of our churches in this country would from certain standpoints be lamentable, and involve serious and perhaps irreparable losses. Precious memorials of past days, records and other irreplaceable data, to say nothing of actual material destruction, would all have to be placed on the debit side of such a universal wiping out of existing ecclesiastical edifices as is here suggested. On the credit side, however, as this minister rightly points out, would be the elimination of all these barriers which now divide congregation from congregation and denomination from denomination. The burning of great cities in the past has not resulted in any such manner as is here forecasted, for the reason that stricken people have hastened immediately to rebuild their churches along with their homes and business houses. But it is to be noted that our ministerial friend proposes not only the destruction of the churches themselves, but the forcing of the people for a period of at least five years to "worship in theatres." He evidently believes, as we certainly do, that this compulsion would inevitably bring together people who had never been united before; and that at the end of the five years, most of them would be so reluctant to separate that a common church for worship and for work would undoubtedly be their one desire. What is involved in this remarkable statement, after all, is simply a common-sense idea that if all sorts and conditions of people can meet together for purposes of entertainment and instruction, they ought also to be able to meet in a church for purposes of inspiration. There is no more reason why the citizens of a community should divide up into competitive groups when they seek the company of God, than when they seek the company of the muses. In other words, we ought to have community churches exactly as we have community theatres, art galleries, libraries, etc. We are no pyromaniac; the destruction of our own church nearly two years ago, taught us full well the material and spiritual losses involved in such a disaster. But on the whole we are inclined to believe that, in the long run, nothing better could happen for the higher interests of religion than the wiping out of all our church edifices tomorrow morning, and the forced assembly of people in theatres and public auditoriums next Sunday.

What we reported last week of Montana is now repeated of Ohio. Only recently the Ohio Federation of Churches held ministers' conventions in twenty counties of the state, to consider rural church problems. Several principles were agreed upon by the representatives of the twelve different denominations who were present at these gatherings. One provision was that in a community of less than one thousand (1,000) people, one Protestant church was adequate for all religious needs. Another agreement was that in communities not large enough to support more than one church, and yet now having more than one, a single denomination should have exclusive control, or the churches should federate under joint denominational influence. A church in complete authority in a community was ordered to pay the resident minister a salary of not less than $1,500, and provide him with a house, an adequately equipped church plant, and an automobile. This movement, although not so announced in the denominational papers, is of course a long step in the direction of the community church. It marks a definite shift of the basis of church organization *from the denomination to the community*—which is the essential thing! In such undertakings as this, of course, denominational lines are still recognized and, so far as possible, preserved; but this means simply that everything cannot be accomplished immediately. Once get the community claim established as prior to the sectarian claim, and everything else will follow in due time.

Duty to Civilization

VII.

Thursday, July 30th, was a very busy day at the London Foreign Office. The House of Commons had adjourned that morning at twelve minutes after three o'clock after the second reading of the Inebriates Bill. At question time Grey referred to the international situation:

> "There is very little that I can say. I regret I cannot say that the situation is less grave than it was yesterday. The outstanding facts are the same. Austria has begun war against Serbia, and Russia has ordered a partial mobilization, which has not hitherto led to any corresponding steps by other Powers, so far as our information goes. We continue to pursue the one great object, to preserve European peace, and for this purpose are keeping in close touch with other Powers. In this keeping in touch we have, I am glad to say, had no difficulty so far, though it has not been possible for the Powers to unite in joint diplomatic action as was proposed on Monday."

That was about four o'clock in the afternoon of the day when he sent his dispatch No. 105 contain-

ing the Cambon letters, together with the document from the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, Viviani, to the British Ambassador at Paris. The letters referred to in this dispatch were those exchanged by Grey and Cambon in November, 1912, relating to the secret conversations between the British and French military and naval staffs, begun at the time of the Anglo-French Agreement in 1904, and continued until the outbreak of hostilities with Grey's sanction. Cambon, in sending the letters and the document from Viviani, must have thought it was high time to nail Grey down. Poincaré also thought so; for Grey received that morning dispatch No. 99 from the British Ambassador at Paris, which reported a direct appeal from the French President, who said: "If His Majesty's Government announced that England would come to the aid of France in the event of a conflict between France and Germany as a result of the present differences between Austria and Serbia, there would be no war, for Germany would at once modify her attitude." Everything was done by Russia and France to force a public declaration from Grey that Britain would fulfil her secret military and naval obligations.

The Viviani document, enclosure 3 in No. 105, which Cambon handed to Grey on the morning of Thursday, the 30th, states: "The German army had its advance posts on our frontiers yesterday (Friday) and German patrols twice penetrated on to our territory. Our advance posts are withdrawn to a distance of ten kilometers from the frontier." The document is dated Paris, July 31st, 1914. It was published in the first edition of the British White Paper; the dates were eliminated in the second edition, when it became clear to the British Foreign Office editor that Cambon in London on the 30th could not very well be in possession of a document issued from Paris on the 31st, and that the German army with all its efficiency could not invade French territory for the first time "yesterday (Friday) when yesterday would be Thursday." The document, however, in the original version did its work; it scared Grey. Viviani made much of his distance of "ten kilometers from the frontier." Why not, with Russia driving hard against the eastern frontiers of Germany, and the British Expeditionary Force bound to be on hand on the French left, why shouldn't he keep his army in reserve and wait until Germany kicked by Russia was forced to invade Belgium? One has only to glance at the works of Haldane, French, Repington, and any number of other British authors, to see how easily this arrangement would work. Viviani knew quite well that it was understood by the terms of the Franco-Russian Military Convention of August 17th, 1892, that the Entente military and naval authorities would understand that mobilization was to be considered a declaration of war. In the circumstances it was, therefore, a simple matter for Viviani to keep some troops "ten kilometers from the frontier"; but he was over-anxious to make a case against Germany. In the now famous paragraph in that document which says: "As you see Germany has done it (the "it" changed to "so" in the second edition of the British White Paper), I will add that all my information goes to show that German preparations began on Saturday, the very day on which the Austrian note was handed in," Viviani was wrong again, for the Austrian note was not handed in on Saturday. The word "Saturday" must have referred to the date on which the Serbian reply was communicated to the Austrian Government; but what does it matter, when you are engaged in secret diplomacy, so long as you make some attempt at proving what is not so?

It is obvious from the dispatches received at the London Foreign Office on July 30th, that the British ambassadors at Paris, Berlin, Vienna and Rome were working more in the interests of the Entente allies than in the interests of European peace. Goschen and Grey, moreover, never seemed to get in touch with each other at the right moment. Of course, events passed rapidly, but not so fast as to preclude the possibility of the British ambassadors bringing pressure to bear on Russia as well as on Austria. Nevertheless, that Germany was the Power that forced Austria to accept the proposal of direct exchange of views with Russia is clear.

Berlin, July 30th, 1914.

"The report of Count Pourtalés, the German Ambassador at St. Petersburg, does not harmonize with the account which your Excellency has given of the attitude of the Austro-Hungarian Government. Apparently there is a misunderstanding which I beg you to clear up. We cannot expect Austro-Hungary to negotiate with Serbia, with which she is in a state of war. The refusal, however, to exchange views with St. Petersburg would be a grave mistake. We are indeed ready to fulfill our duty. As an ally we must, however, refuse to be drawn into a world conflagration through Austria-Hungary not respecting our advice. Your Excellency will express this to Count Berchtold with all emphasis and great seriousness. *"Bethmann-Hollweg."*

This telegram must have had the desired effect, for Grey telegraphed the next day to the British Ambassador at St. Petersburg:

(Telegraphic) Foreign Office, July 31, 1914.

I learn from the German Ambassador that, as a result of suggestions by the German Government, a conversation has taken place at Vienna between the Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Russian Ambassador. The Austrian Ambas-

sador at St. Petersburg has also been instructed that he may converse with the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs, and that he should give explanations about the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia, and discuss suggestions and any questions directly affecting Austro-Russian relations. If the Russian Government object to the Austrians mobilizing eight army corps, it might be pointed out that this is not too great a number against 400,000 Serbians.

The German Ambassador asked me to urge the Russian Government to show good will in the discussions and to suspend their military preparations.

It is with great satisfaction that I have learnt that discussions are being resumed between Austria and Russia, and you should express this to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and tell him that I earnestly hope he will encourage them.

I informed the German Ambassador that, as regards military preparations, I did not see how Russia could be urged to suspend them unless some limit were put by Austria to the advance of her troops into Serbia.

Moreover, Grey heard that morning from the British Ambassador at Vienna: "French Ambassador hears from Berlin that the German Ambassador at Vienna is instructed to speak seriously to the Austro-Hungarian government against acting in a manner calculated to provoke a European War."

The next dispatch from Berlin to Grey, July 31st, indicated what effect Russian mobilization had on the mind of the German Chancellor:

(Telegraphic.) Berlin, July 31st, 1914.

Chancellor informs me that his efforts to preach peace and moderation at Vienna have been seriously handicapped by the Russian mobilization against Austria. He has done everything possible to attain his object at Vienna, perhaps even rather more than was altogether palatable at the Ballplatz. He could not, however, leave his country defenceless while time was being utilized by other Powers; and if, as he learns is the case, military measures are now being taken by Russia against Germany also, it would be impossible for him to remain quiet. He wished to tell me that it was quite possible that in a very short time, today perhaps, the German Government would take some very serious step; he was, in fact, just on the point of going to have an audience with the Emperor.

His Excellency added that the news of the active preparations on the Russo-German frontier had reached him just when the Czar had appealed to the Emperor, in the name of their old friendship, to mediate at Vienna, and when the Emperor was actually conforming to that request.

Later the same day another startling telegram from Berlin was received by Grey:

(Telegraphic.) Berlin, July 31st, 1914.

According to information just received by German Government from their Ambassador at St. Petersburg, whole Russian army and fleet are being mobilized. Chancellor tells me that "Kriegsgefahr" will be proclaimed at once by German Government, as it can only be against Germany that Russian general mobilization is directed. Mobilization would follow almost immediately. His Excellency added in explanation that "Kriegsgefahr" signified the taking of certain precautionary measures consequent upon strained relations with a foreign country.

This news from St. Petersburg, added his Excellency, seemed to him to put an end to all hope of a peaceful solution of the crisis. Germany must certainly prepare for all emergencies.

I asked him whether he could not still put pressure on the authorities at Vienna to do something in general interests to reassure Russia and to show themselves disposed to continue discussions on a friendly basis. He replied that last night he had begged Austria to reply to your last proposal, and that he had received a reply to the effect that Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs would take wishes of the Emperor this morning in the matter.

The first information received in Berlin of the Russian mobilization came on July 26th, then the German Chancellor sent the following telegram to Count Pourtalés, the Ambassador in St. Petersburg:

"Preparatory military measures by Russia will force us to counter measures which must consist in mobilizing the army. Mobilization however means war. Knowing the obligations of France toward Russia, this mobilization would be directed against both Russia and France. We cannot assume that Russia desires to bring about such a European war. Since Austria-Hungary will not call in question the existence of the Serbian kingdom, we are of opinion that Russia can afford to assume an attitude of waiting. We can all the more sincerely support the desire of Russia to protect the integrity of Serbia as Austria-Hungary does not intend to infringe upon the latter. It will be easy in the further development of the affair to find a basis for an understanding."

Mr. Fay, in *The American Historical Review*, has dealt very faithfully with the documents referring to Russian mobilization, and his analysis of the orders of the military authorities proves conclusively that Russia was to blame for beginning the war. The

perfidy of the Russian military chiefs has been exposed to the world, and no doubt General Sukhomlinov will be known to posterity as "the man who lied to the Czar." At his trial he admitted that much. That, however, is no reason why the Czar himself should be exonerated from blame. That poor weak-minded, wretched creature in his telegrams to his cousin, Welhelm, did not tell the truth, if one can rely upon the statements that were circulated in England at the beginning of the war by persons who were in St. Petersburg during the last week of July. The telegrams from the *Times's* correspondent in St. Petersburg do not agree with the statements made by the Czar:

St. Petersburg, July 27th.

"The Czar left tonight on his trip to the Finnish Skerries. Now that matters appear to have become calmer it may not be amiss to quote a sentence used by the Czar at the close of the Grand Council on Saturday (25th): 'We have stood this sort of thing,' he said, 'for seven and a half years. This is enough.' Thereupon his Majesty authorized the issue of orders for a partial mobilization confined to the fourteen Army Corps on the Austrian frontier. At the same time an intimation was given to Germany that orders for the mobilization of the remainder of the Russian Army would follow immediately upon mobilization by Germany."

On July 29th, Reuter's Petersburg correspondent telegraphed: "Confident of England's support, about which doubts have mostly disappeared, the Russian public is prepared to accept war."

Peace never had a chance. No matter how much Austria was to blame for her obstinacy and stupidity in not accepting the Serbian reply, Russia's intervention on behalf of Serbia not only complicated the whole European situation, because of the secret alliances, but jeopardized anything that was attempted in the way of seeking a peaceful solution.

The action taken from the earliest by the German Foreign Office in connection with the dispute between Austria and Serbia is now pretty clear from the documents that have been published. It is also clear that on July 26th Bethmann-Hollweg telegraphed to the German Ambassadors at London, Paris and St. Petersburg that "Austria having officially declared to Russia that she had no intention to acquire new territory, nor to touch the existence of the kingdom of Serbia, the decision as to an European war rests solely with Russia, which has to bear the entire responsibility." That was quite a correct view of the situation. On the 27th of July, Bethmann-Hollweg had not received news of the suggestion made by Grey of a conference of the four Powers to be held in London, but the German Chancellor that day urged Berchtold that Sazonov desired a direct exchange of views between Russia and Austria. Hostilities had, however, opened between Austria and Serbia, and Berchtold considered Grey's proposal of a conference had come too late. Still, conversations were proceeding between Austria and Russia when the effect of Russian mobilization against Austria jeopardized the whole business.

The true course of diplomatic negotiations as they passed in Vienna between the 28th and 30th of July is recorded in the report of Sir Maurice de Bunsen, British Ambassador at Vienna, dated London, September 1st, 1914. He says:

"M. Schebeko (Russian Ambassador in Vienna) endeavored on the 28th of July to persuade the Austro-Hungarian Government to furnish Count Szapary (Austrian-Hungarian Ambassador at St. Petersburg) with full powers to continue at St. Petersburg the hopeful conversations which had there been taking place between the latter and M. Sazonov. Count Berchtold refused at the time, but two days later (30th July), though in the meantime Russia had partially mobilized against Austria, he received M. Schebeko again in a perfectly friendly manner, and gave his consent to the continuance of the conversations at St. Petersburg. From now onwards the tension between Russia and Germany was much greater than between Russia and Austria. As between the latter an arrangement seemed almost in sight, and on the 1st August I was informed by M. Schebeko (Russian Ambassador at Vienna) that Count Szapary (Austro-Hungarian Ambassador at St. Petersburg) had at last conceded the main point at issue by announcing to M. Sazonov that Austria would consent to submit to mediation the points in the note to Serbia which seemed incompatible with the maintenance of Serbian independence. M. Sazonov, Mr. Schebeko added, had accepted this proposal on condition that Austria would refrain from the actual invasion of Serbia. Austria, in fact, had finally yielded, and that she herself had at this point good hopes of a peaceful issue is shown by the communication made to you on the 1st August by Count Mensdorff (Austrian Ambassador at London) to the effect that Austria had neither "banged the door" on compromise nor cut off the conversations. M. Schebeko to the end was working hard for peace. He was using the most conciliatory language to Count Berchtold, and he informed me that the latter, as well as Count Forgach (Austro-Hungarian Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs) had responded in the same spirit. Certainly it was too much for Russia to expect that Austria would hold back her

armies, but this matter could probably have been settled by negotiation, and M. Schebeko repeatedly told me he was prepared to accept any reasonable compromise. Unfortunately these conversations at St. Petersburg and Vienna were cut short by the transfer of the dispute to the more dangerous ground of a direct conflict between Germany and Russia."

Although Austria took a long time to accept all the proposals of the Powers for mediation, in the end she conceded everything, as Sir Maurice de Bunsen proves, and everything that she conceded was wholly in Russia's favor, the Power which meant war from the first, and the Power that had backed Serbia in all her negotiations. It was Russia, not Austria nor Germany, that drew France, Britain and Belgium into a catastrophe through the secret agreements entered into by the military and naval staffs of the Entente Powers. Dispatch No. 113 from the British Ambassador in St. Petersburg to Grey says that Russia decided to issue orders for general mobilization July 31, the general mobilization that had been making rapid progress against the frontiers of Germany and Austria since July 25th. When it was known in Berlin that the order for general mobilization of the Russian forces had been issued, the German Government sent an imperative dispatch to Russia saying that full mobilization would follow Russia's, if she did not within twelve hours stop the military measures she was taking against Germany and Austria, and, with full knowledge of the terms of the Franco-Russian military Convention of August 17th, 1892, Germany gave France eighteen hours to determine whether she would remain neutral in a Russo-German war. If Russia made any reply to Germany's request it never reached Berlin. France gave no definite reply, but said she would do what she considered best in her interests. On August 1st, at five p. m., the time given to Russia having expired, Germany ordered a mobilization of her entire army and navy, just about the time when Russian troops crossed the frontier and invaded German territory.

The way the Russian torrent poured into East Prussia amazed everybody. Memel was attacked on August 3rd, and on August 7th Rennenkampf's main army crossed the German frontier at Suwalki. After a battle, which raged heavily for four days, the Germans were defeated at Gumbinnen on the 20th. The next day, at Frankenau and Orlau, the Russians were victorious, and by the 25th Russia occupied all of East Prussia as far west as the Vistula. No wonder people in Paris and London spoke of the Russian steamroller being in Berlin before Christmas.

FRANCIS NEILSON.

(To be continued.)

CONTRIBUTED

Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature

VII.

HENRIK IBSEN.

Henrik Ibsen, 1828-1906, born in Norway, is by far the greatest of all the writers who have appeared in that country. His fame has extended widely, and he has been the cause of much controversy in England, as well as elsewhere. His admirers have regarded him as the greatest of modern dramatists, and he has undoubtedly revolutionized that art in several directions. He was the first to effectively introduce social problems into the drama, and to discuss therein questions of the first importance in the relations of the individual to society. Probably no poet or dramatist has given greater recognition to the new conceptions of woman's position in society than has been done by Ibsen. He was as much an anarchist as Tolstoy in his recognition of the rights and privileges of the individual, though he by no means accepted religion in the Tolstoyan manner or degree.

Ibsen's manner of dealing with social problems has been a chief source of his world-wide recognition as a great dramatist. Otto Heller, in his book on Ibsen's "Plays and Problems," says that he contributed his share to the creation of a new social order. Henry James was of the opinion that Ibsen sounded in our literary life a singularly interesting hour. Bernard Shaw placed Ibsen above Shakespeare as a dramatist, and said that he was a prophet aiding in the creation of a modern Bible. Hamlin Garland has been more consistent in asserting that Ibsen may be taken to represent the whole movement in dramatic art commonly called realism, which stands for actuality. Arthur Symons has found that Ibsen is unsurpassed as the inventor of dramatic situations. More living characters than his have never moved on the stage, for with them he has peopled a new world.

Ibsen was a poet as well as a dramatist. His lyrical poetry, though small in volume, is recognized as having distinct merit. His early dramas were in verse form, and his poetic ability as shown in them is highly praised by those competent to judge of their merit. All his dramas show a vigorous imagination at work, and his use of symbolism has commended his plays to many persons. Original, creative, unique has been his work; and of unsurpassed merit in its interpretation of human life in its many phases.

In his earlier dramas Ibsen made large use of Norwegian traditions and legends, interpreting them in the light of modern experiences, and his own conceptions of morality and religion. The heroic life of the saga and viking ages had a large meaning for him, and he gave these old tales a new vitality on the stage. In such dramas as "The Viking's Barrow," "Mistress Inger at Oestraat," and "The Warriors in Helgeland," Ibsen revived the tales of the past and made them serve his dramatic purposes. Then followed a series of plays in which Ibsen dealt with certain phases of contemporary life in Norway, such as "Brand" and "Peer Gynt." Here his powers as a satirist and critic found full expression. The religious fanaticism of those who exact the full measure of religious belief and conduct is brought out

most emphatically in Brand, who would have all or nothing in the way of puritanical fidelity to his creed.

The conservative, if not the reactionary spirit, which dominated in Norway in his early years, had from Ibsen the most scathing criticism. It was not merely the slow and unprogressive tendencies in his country that provoked Ibsen to their criticism, but he satirized them in the most incisive manner, laughing at them, turning them into contempt. Naturally this manner of treating Norwegian traditions, customs and religious beliefs, provoked resentment, and Ibsen was subjected to the most vigorous condemnation and criticism.

Then followed the series of social dramas, in which Ibsen put forth his constructive ideas, though he continued to criticize the customs and institutions of his country. He brought his weapons of satire, laughter, criticism and condemnation to bear upon the follies he saw about him, and he made use of them in an unsparing manner. What he saw to disapprove was lack of independence, freedom and initiative, and what he desired was liberty, individuality and original insight. In such dramas as "Pillars of Society," "A Doll's House," "Ghosts," "An Enemy of the People," "The Wild Duck" and "Rosmersholm" Ibsen brought to bear on existing social conditions his conceptions of what the modern spirit demands in the way of reform and growth.

Ibsen was as much an individualist as Tolstoy, and constructively he was as thoroughly an anarchist. The right of the individual to think and act for himself, and not to submit to social conventions, was what he pleaded for in these plays. He insisted that the majority, when acting together in party or church, are almost certainly in the wrong. On the other hand, the minority of intelligent men are almost certainly in the right. The majority relies on custom, conventionality and tradition, while the few men who reason for themselves and are of an independent habit of mind, are most likely to lead the way to reform and progress. The free-thinking individual guides mankind, for he looks at all problems with regard to their justice and their rationality, and not with reference to whether they have been accepted in the past.

Ibsen was of the opinion that both church and state are enemies of mankind, that they interfere with individual initiative, that they are not progressive in their methods, and that they are far too largely committed to the past. When the individual is free of the conditions imposed by these institutions he can and will govern himself; and in a far better and more effective manner than is done by them, however worthy they may be. Liberty for the individual was what Ibsen most desired, especially for those individuals who are affirmative, inventive, and pioneers. All progress comes from such individuals, the born leaders of mankind, without whom no progress could be made.

Ibsen had no conception of social leadership, mass action, collective progress, the general advance made by group initiative. He might have accepted Emerson's dictum that institutions are the shadows of great men; and had no idea that the institutions are the very causes of there being any leaders capable of initiative. Apparently he had not grasped the idea of the continuity of human effort, that all progressive men stand on the shoulders of those who have gone before them or that state and church are the means by which individuals are able to lead mankind in progressive movements.

Ibsen was so far consistent in his pleas for individuality that he would have it possessed by women quite as much as by men. In several of his plays he demanded that women should be free to live their own lives, that they should not be under the domination of men, and that under the conditions of marriage the wife should not be merely a shadow of her husband, subject to his whim. This demand especially found expression in "A Doll's House," in which the woman leaves her husband and children, in order that she may find and develop her womanhood. The conventional (and legal) idea of marriage rebelled against this demand of Ibsen's, and perhaps no play of his was more fiercely attacked than this one. He was not convinced, however, and he fought back on this occasion, as so many times before, with a fiercer and more insistent assertion of his opinions. No one had more of courage than he, and he would not be convinced by condemnation or by resort to conventional requirements.

For a time Ibsen was accepted as an advocate for the rights of women; but he regarded the subject from a broader point of view than that of votes for women. He desired that women should be given freedom in all directions, that they should be accorded the largest measure of individual initiative, and that they should control their own bodies and minds.

In "Ghosts" Ibsen most strenuously condemned the control of the present by the past, and that the mind should be under the domination of tradition. In this play he set forth his ideas on the subject of heredity, that the evil habits and vices of parents descend to their children, and that it is often the children who bear the burdens of the pleasures and dissipations of the parents. Here Ibsen was in accord with the theories of heredity held in his time, which would not be accepted by the biologists and eugenicists of the present day. Drunkenness, licentiousness and crime in the father do not necessarily descend upon his son, as Ibsen maintains in this play. The play was a bold answer to his critics on the part of Ibsen, even though its presentation of the laws of heredity was mistaken.

Georg Brandes has well defined Ibsen's conception of human progress presented in his social dramas when he says that he "does not feel himself to be the son of a fatherland, part of a whole, the leader of a group, a member of a community; he simply feels himself to be a gifted individual, and the one thing he really believes in is personality." By the side of this statement should be placed Ibsen's own declaration that "reason does not imperatively demand that the individual should be a citizen. Far from it. The state is the curse of the individual. . . . The state has its root in time, and will ripe and rot in time. Greater things than it will fall—religion, for example. Neither moral conceptions or art-forms have an eternity in them." Here we have Ibsen the anarchist stating his creed without compromise, and with the assertiveness often characteristic of him. He not only believed that nationality was dying out, but that moral conceptions and art ideals are in the process of radical change. He wrote to one of his correspondents that he had expanded from being a Norwegian to being a Scandinavian, then to a Teutonic conception of social obligations, and that he had finally become a European in his moral and intellectual be-

liefs. He did not add that his ideas had become human in the broadest meanings of that word. Perhaps that was meant when he wrote "that man is right who has allied himself most closely with the future." He also wrote that national consciousness is being replaced by racial consciousness.

Ibsen criticized the church of his time. Though he gave no definite statement of his religious beliefs, it may be assumed that he was liberal in his thought on this subject. His religious creed must have been largely shaped by scientific ideas. In the "Emperor and Galilean" he asserts that Paganism and Christianity will in time be succeeded by a third empire, in which belief and life will be modern and scientific. He evidently did not accept any moral code, not even that of Christianity, as final or other than relative to the time in which it appears.

Ibsen, vigorous individualist as he was, expressed his interest in socialism, and wrote that he had studied the teachings and actions of the social-democratic party with appreciation. He belonged to no political party, as he belonged to no church. He kept himself wholly free to think for himself, with no obligations to follow what others might find to be the truth. In this respect, he was one of the most independent students of social conditions about him, committed to no traditions, parties or beliefs, an observer watching all movements of mankind, and criticizing or interpreting them with entire freedom as an independent student.

When Ibsen's plays were translated into English, and were presented on the London stage, they aroused a prolonged and fierce controversy. They were severely criticized for their social and moral heresies, for their attacks on marriage and religion, for their coarseness and vulgarity, and for their dramatic rejection of stage requirements. The radicals of the time, such men as Shaw, Gosse, Wicksteed and Archer, defended and interpreted him with zeal, while a large number of others criticized him for his immoralities, his disregard of the laws of stage production, and for his social heresies. Shaw's placing him above Shakespeare did not conduce to his acceptance by conservative Englishmen. The critics were bitter, persistent and vehement. The appearance of each new play renewed the attack, and as time went on the criticism, instead of subsiding, grew more extreme and uncompromising. Miriam Alice Franc, in her "Ibsen in England," has given a detailed account of this controversy. In the end Ibsen won, the English dramatists accepted his methods, and the reading public came to accept his plays with avidity. Miss Franc concludes her book by saying that Ibsen has his hosts of English readers, and is as alive today in England as when he was first popularized.

In one other direction a word should be said in regard to Ibsen. In his later works, such as "The Master Builder," "John Gabriel Borkman," and "When We Dead Awaken," Ibsen was pronouncedly a symbolist. Much has been made of this phase of his work by some of his interpreters. Those who have appreciated his realism, his social interpretation, and his pleas for individuality, were not prepared for this mystical tendency on his part. In fact, this inclination to symbolism was present in "Brand," and others of his earliest plays. Doubtless this was a phase of his individualism, his confidence that the individual is sufficient to himself, and that his insights are to be regarded as supreme. In his later years this tendency grew on him, and instead of reading nature as to what it is in itself, he injected into it mystical interpretations of his own devising. Nature became something else than what it appears to the plain man, and human experience has found for it meanings not seen on the surface. Whether this tendency follows a false leading or whether it is justified on the part of the poet, will be accepted or rejected in accordance with the habits of individual readers. From a purely dramatic point of view the symbolism is not effective. From the standpoint of ethical conceptions it is a source of confusion.

In the end Ibsen won a great success, and he is now accepted as one of the greatest of the world's poets and dramatists. If his extreme individualism does not meet with entire acceptance, his plea for freedom and initiative has been abundantly justified. His demands for social reinterpretation there are now few to condemn.

GEORGE WILLIS COOKE.

Youth

Youth is not a time of life; it is a state of mind; it is not a matter of rosy cheeks, red lips and supple knees; it is a temper of the will, a quality of the imagination, a vigor of the emotions; it is the freshness of the deep springs of life.

Youth means a temperamental predominance of courage over timidity of the appetite for adventure over the love of ease. This often exists in a man of sixty more than a boy of twenty. Nobody grows old by merely a number of years. We grow old by deserting our ideals.

Years may wrinkle the skin, but to give up enthusiasm wrinkles the soul. Worry, fear, self-distrust bows the heart and turns the spirit back to dust.

Whether sixty or sixteen, there is in every human being's heart the lure of wonder, the unfailing childlike appetite of what's next, and the joy of the game of living. In the center of your heart and my heart is an ever green tree, which keeps you young; when it dies you are old.

In your and my heart there is a wireless station; so long as it receives messages of beauty, hope, cheer, courage and power from men and from the Infinite, so long you are young.

When the aerials are down, and your spirit is covered with snows of cynicism and the ice of pessimism, then you are grown old, even at twenty, but as long as your aerials are up, to catch the waves of optimism, there is hope you may die young at eighty.

SAMUEL ULLMAN.

THE TOILERS.

In office dark, where sushine never cheers,
Where screeching wheels and clanging bells annoy;
In noisome air, among great piles of coal,
In dust and steam,
Bending and sweating till exhaustion grim;
Dying, perchance, to save me from a bruise,
Living it may be without inner light,
Yet toiling on in dreary, changeless round,—
And all that I may ride to greet my love!
Tell me, O God, what may I do for these?

DOMBEY.

A Mountain Interlude

Spread out upon the green floor of a high valley in the Bavarian Alps, close upon the border of the Austrian Tyrol, stands the ancient German monastery of Éttal. Surrounded by the forested slopes and snow-embroidered peaks of mountain ranges that glow with royal colors when the sun goes down, and fringed nearer at hand by its own fertile vineyards and fruit gardens, which have been cultivated by successive generations of cloistered men since it was founded by the Emperor Louis II, called the Bavarian, in 1333, the old monastery church, with its great central dome, built in the Gothic style by Emperor Louis and remodelled in the more worldly baroque during the eighteenth century, contains elaborately beautiful ceiling-frescoes and altar-paintings and a large and famous organ.

Up the road that winds from the city of Partenkirchen to this mountain-citadel, which provided a refuge from the warring world to several hundred men for several centuries and a home for art and industry and religion during all that time, two young Americans with a taste for the past were journeying in the prudent enjoyment of a Bavarian holiday. Passing the wayside shrines with their carved figures and paintings of the Virgin and the suffering Christ that marked the stations of the cross, and breathing with increasing satisfaction the morning mountain air as the road ascended, they came, at the end of a two hours' drive, into full view of the ancient group of buildings, whose yellow walls and red-tiled roofs, surmounted by the massive dome, were framed in a beautiful amphitheater of hills that were already touched with green under the magic of the April sun. A few moments later they entered the open courtyard, descended from their carriage and stood within the twilight of the chapel in the ancient cloister of Éttal.

Before them, at the end of a long aisle, shone the altar, its pascal candles burning—for it was Easter time, and Easter is the greatest festival of the church—with its holy paintings ranged above it, upon which some devoted artist-monk had lavished the creative energy of his entire life. Here and there about the chapel peasants in the colorful Bavarian costume knelt in prayer or visiting strangers like themselves stood silently apart in thoughtful admiration. Presently a priest wearing a long dark gown approached them with a formal nod, and said: *"Sind sie Franzosen?"* ("Are you French people?") Why he should have thought that they were French they never knew, unless it were that the keenness with which all Germans fear the coming of their ancient enemy in these troubled days, had got the better of his judgment. They hastened to assure him that they were Americans, however, and added, by way of further assurance, that they were members of the Mission which the Quakers had sent to bring a daily meal of nourishing food to the impoverished and hungry children in a thousand towns and villages of Germany, upon which the invisible hand of famine and disease had fallen so heavily, to the injury of Europe and the world.

The old priest's eyes glowed at this with a warm cordiality. He smiled, and vanished down the aisle in the direction of the altar. A few moments later he returned, bringing with him another, who shook hands with the Americans and told them something which they were not in the least prepared to hear: "The royal family of Bavaria is in the monastery this morning," he said. "The young prince has just taken holy vows and has conducted mass for the first time today. His sister and mother and Prince Leopold wish to speak with you. Will you be so kind?" And he pointed towards an inner door.

A little uncomfortable and bewildered by this unexpected situation and the sudden necessity of ceremony, the young Americans moved forward accompanied by the priest and, before they had taken a dozen steps, beheld two ladies coming towards them. The one was young and fair, the other elderly with graying hair. Both were dressed simply, with quiet elegance, in black. The princess spoke first, extending her hand: "We know what you have done and are doing," she said, "for the unhappy children of our country who suffer so terribly from hunger and disease, and we desire to thank you heartily and very sincerely." Taking the proffered hand in her own the American girl answered: "It is very little that we have been able to do in comparison with the need."

"But at least you have come," said the Queen mother with dignity, as she also shook hands with each of them. "At least you have come and we want you to know that we are deeply thankful."

And with that the ladies rejoined their party as quietly as they had come, leaving the two Americans in the company of the cordial old priest to ponder upon the significance of an unforgettable experience and to comment to each other upon the simple sincerity with which the royal thanks of the Wittelsbachs had been given for what they liked to believe was the finest and most enduring expression of Americanism.

And it was not strange that when they left the cloister of Éttal an hour later, and saw the lovely panorama of the valley lying before them, an old refrain ran through their heads:

"How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of those who bring tidings of peace!"

BRENT DOW ALLINSON.

A Modern German Leader

Among the individual forces which in Germany today are striving to reconstruct its social and religious life in accord with the new demands and needs of the time, Professor Martin Rade stands prominent. He is editor of the widely known and progressive weekly, *Die Christliche Welt,* the organ of the recently organized society, Gegenwarts Christentum (Present-Day Christianity), into which five previously existing liberal associations were consolidated. As a member of the theological faculty of the University of Marburg he has long been known as an able scholar and teacher of enlightened opinion. A devoted member of the International Congress of Religious Liberty, he took an active part in its sessions in Boston, Berlin and Paris (1913). A member of the Prussian State Legislature, he has been a leader of the Democratic National Party, which seeks to mediate between the reactionary Imperial and Military elements and the extreme Socialists. Amid all the chaos and strife now existing in his country he keeps a clear head, an undimmed vision, an optimistic faith. In a recent editorial he tells us:

The ignorance, passion and insanity of the present generation are due to the faults and failures of the generation that preceded. The men and women of today are not the children

of the new time; they are the product of the old order that has passed away forever. Many look back with longing to the former condition of things in state, church, school and business, as to a lost paradise. But that is sheer folly. Some things, doubtless, were better in those days. But as a whole the past order in Germany was not good, or it would never have given birth to such evils as afflict our present life. It was the evil seed which produced the present bitter fruit. Therefore our hope and our safety lie in the future. Forward is the motto for us today.

These words might as justly be spoken to Americans who sigh for a return to "normalcy" and similar delusions and who misread our country's past, shrink from the problems and tasks the present hour brings with it, and mistrust the possibilities of a better future for us and for all.

A recent letter from Professor Rade is of such interest that the writer desires to share it with the readers of UNITY.

Marburg, Hessia, March 25, 1921.

That the inclination in America to help us Germans is not greater should not cause us wonder. The benevolences of America are great. From all sides they are called upon; not only from Germany, and it is hard for Americans at present to love us. They once had a high opinion of us and have been severely disappointed in us. In the first place, they still believe that we were chiefly guilty for the war. I certainly am among those who earnestly acknowledge the complicity in guilt of our government, and consequently our people. On the other hand, it remains true that our people, as such, did not wish this war. We were plunged into it entirely purblind, and the responsibility for it on our part falls on a few leaders and thin sections of our population. But I am not concerned to emphasize this. I would rather keep silence than to say things which for us are entirely understandable, but are not comprehensible by strangers.

Secondly, Americans do not understand our present attitude. They do not believe that we have become a real democracy, and it is true that large groups of people among us, including also and in particular academic circles, are monarchic and reactionary in their sentiments. Is this surprising, after such a historic past as we have had? But the fact remains that since November, 1918, our German empire has been a republic, and that the states comprising it are all republics. It is governed in a democratic manner by its ministers and parliaments. I believe this government to be firmly established. For a revolution initiated by the party of the Right would meet a determined opposition from the working elements and large sections of the burgher classes. The Entente will see to it that the Monarchy and Militarism are not forced upon us from without. And our whole historic and world situation also assures it. You may make what use you will of this representation of our political conditions, for it is authentic and dependable. Only catastrophes that are inconceivable could change this state of affairs.

In the meantime, through help from America, the appearance of the *Christliche Welt* is assured for the remainder of the year 1921. After that we must be prepared for its suspension or abandonment, unless some fortunate intervention enables us to keep on our way. Our subscription list is increasing, but our German supporters throughout belong to the classes of society which are least able to maintain themselves and us.

So far as our inner life is concerned, the prospects of Liberal Protestantism in Germany are very disheartening. Protestantism as a whole, because of the conflict between Germany on the one side and England and the United States on the other, is extremely weakened and endangered. The real victor in this world war has been Rome. Since the Revolution in Germany has put an end to the state churches, and these are to become people's churches, it appears that the liberal element in the churches are far too individualistic to maintain themselves against the conservative-orthodox majorities. Nearly everywhere we are compelled to found our claims to existence and representation on the legally guaranteed rights of minorities. But these rights must first be vindicated and achieved. This is not without prospect of success, but just what form the development will take no one as yet sees clearly.

CHARLES W. WENDTE.

SELECTED

Pacific Peace

The peace of the Pacific—how can it be preserved? This is Sunday—it will be a good day to consider this problem of the immediate future.

Is the Pacific to repeat the history of the bloody wars that have been waged around the Atlantic?

A Chicago man and I were looking at the wonderful sunset last night, when he said it ought to be easy enough for the peoples on all the shores of this big ocean to live in peace—and how much better it would be for all, and there is room enough for all.

It looks that way. The ocean is so big. We have not sighted more than three or four ships in three weeks sailing. Plenty of elbow room, surely.

Yet, when I recall the bitter and ignorant words that are spoken, by one people about the other, it makes one fearful.

There is every reason for peace—trade, education, religion, industry. No nation on the Pacific has anything to gain by war.

My idea is that peace could be preserved by any one of three powers.

The governments themselves could do it. War between Japan and America would be suicidal to both nations—everyone concedes this. Yet newspapers on both sides go on telling infernal lies about each other and cheap politicians fan flames of suspicion to win votes. Englishmen and Americans are both spreading unpleasant gossip about each other. Our Federal authorities at San Francisco go out of the way to insult Japanese travelers. The peace of the Pacific—so important to all—could be secured, if government officials would only be half decent, half just.

I have an idea, also, if the governments can't preserve peace on the Pacific, the churches could, if they would. American churches are planting their institutions in India, China, and Japan—their churches, schools and hospitals. If the churches only had some gumption and would get up and demand peace from politicians—there would be peace. But the churches seem to be paralyzed in the presence of war.

Labor is the third agent for preserving peace. The workers can always prevent war, if they would. Will American labor, for example, rise above nationalism, and seek fellowship with the workers all around the Pacific? Consciousness of the solidarity of labor will serve to keep the peace of the Pacific.

The honor is offered to all of these powers. Which will win it?

Seattle Union Record. *Sidney Strong.*

TO AN ORIOLE.

How falls it, oriole, thou hast come to fly
In tropic splendor through our Northern sky?

At some glad moment was it Nature's choice
To dower a scrap of sunset with a voice?

Or did some orange tulip, flaked with black,
In some forgotten garden, ages back,

Yearning toward Heaven until its wish was heard,
Desire unspeakably to be a bird?

Friends' Intelligencer. —*Edgar Fawcett.*

CORRESPONDENCE

A Suggestion for Hopefulness

To the Editor of UNITY:

The spirit of optimism displayed in some of your editorials in UNITY is most encouraging. It does me good to read them, for we all need much heartening these dark and struggling days. It is so hard, so hard, to wait, and we have done so much waiting for six long years! We have waited sometimes in despair, sometimes in hope, for a decision or action that might mean a real forward step toward straightening out an entangling situation. And though frequently that has not finally materialized—yet somehow we have kept on living through the fearful muddle. But what is there to do, however desperate a situation may be, but to keep on hoping and striving in such ways as we can for ultimate triumph of the right?

Now, I am only a very quiet individual without fame or prominence, but, in my opinion, even though H. G. Wells does write: "I want to say that this civilization in which we are living is tumbling down, and, I think, tumbling down very fast; that I think rapid, enormous efforts will be needed to save it; and that I see no such efforts being made at the present time"—that does not settle it! And I differ from him emphatically. I regret that he has put so depressing a question into the minds of so many people—unless it will possibly have the effect of making his readers exclaim, "That must never be!" and so arousing them to some sort of constructive action. I believe that there will be a definite change for the better before long and that even now influences are at work that will result in pulling up the world out of "this bad hole that it is in," as Mr. E. S. Martin puts it, who goes on to say that "the living and visible leaders of mankind do not show much evidence of being equal to the task." I wonder if that is an out and out acknowledgment that the rulers of nations are too feeble mentally to cope with the situations their own folly has produced? Or is it an admission that they are too wilful, too stubborn (it wouldn't do to call it pigheaded, would it?) to relinquish their old outworn methods of procedure even though these be clearly proved inadequate for the unprecedented exigencies now prevailing?

Maybe I am presumptuous in expressing an opinion so strongly in opposition to that of Mr. Wells, whose sources of information are so much more widespread than mine; but it seems to me that he may have overlooked one very considerable source of strength and help for a perishing world in the women. When we contemplate what is going on today we must keep in mind that so far in the world's history politics and business have been conducted by men. (And haven't they made a "right smart" mess of it!) And now, just now, the women are coming into their own and beginning to take a hand in the management of affairs. Their training for many years has prepared them to be ready to meet men on equal ground, and now they are going to accomplish things! So far their efforts seem directed more into political channels, but what they are doing must react upon affairs of the business world—and to their betterment. Some prominent women have already shown themselves the full intellectual equals of men in their understanding of, and dealings with, intricate problems of politics and finance; and as women are naturally endowed with indomitable patience, perseverance and will, these qualities will be used to good effect as they (women) help in the settlement of the world's difficulties.

One thing women are surely, even though slowly, taking upon themselves as a duty. . . . They are working ceaselessly, tirelessly, everywhere for peace—for the unbroken, enduring peace of the world. Women's peace societies are increasing in membership and influence in country on country. Are these women going to be intimidated by men into stopping their efforts to prevent war—even though the men should not approve of possible drastic measures? Don't you believe it? Or are they going to be scared by the immensity of the job? No! No! Don't you believe that, either! When women make up their minds to accomplish an object and organize societies with a definite end, or ends, in view, they are bound to succeed in their undertaking!

Some weeks ago in reports of the convention of the National League of Women Voters we read the electrifying appeal of Mrs. Catt to women to put an end to war. Think of the great work that society can do in arousing and strengthening the aversion to war held by women in general. And the Women's International Suffrage Association of which Mrs. Catt is president and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom whose president is Miss Jane Addams, are tremendous powers for righteousness. Who can say what force these societies might bring to bear at a crucial moment? In a letter to me, Miss Balch, the secretary of the W. I. L. P. F., wrote: "It is immensely interesting, and to me very moving to sit here in Geneva and feel the threads of common purpose stretching from one end of the world to the other." There you have it! "The threads of common purpose." Let us rejoice that so many women today are consecrated to so definite and so glorious a common purpose and are organized to achieve it—for they will succeed.

Women everywhere are realizing now that it is true in all lands as Lord Asquith said in wartime of the women of England, "Without the aid of women England could not carry on the war." And without their advent as voters into the political arena they feel that theirs is now a new and serious responsibility in regard to war. The women are not few and far between who are passionately opposed to war. I believe they may be numbered by the thousands, yes, even hundreds of thousands, and they are thinking such thoughts as these: Of what use is it to train and educate our children to a knowledge of truth and beauty, of science and righteousness, if just as they develop for usefulness and enjoyment they are summoned to battlefields to slaughter others, or be slaughtered, as if they were naught but poisonous reptiles? Of what avail is our boasted civilization if as we progress the most effective things we produce are used not to facilitate our advance and maintain our position, but to draw down upon our own heads our own destruction? Depend upon it, then, that women have absolutely determined to put a stop to war—and if that is done will it not be comparatively easy to regulate little by little other matters? Will not that indeed be the means of saving our civilization from tottering to complete ruin?

So I feel like saying to Mr. Wells and Mr. Martin and other pessimists, "Why worry? Cheer up. The women are at the front and are going to help you men

THE FIELD.

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

THE CREED OF THE FRIENDS.*

Spiritual forces form the foundation upon which our institutions rest. Great social structures, like the family, church, and state, are sustained by the power of faith, loyalty, justice and love. It is not only the kingdom of heaven that is "within" men, but also the empires of earth. When loyalty to the Czar died out of the hearts of the Russian people, Nicholas found himself a helpless man in the midst of his vast estates and former armies. Napoleon could conquer Europe after he got an army of soldiers, willing to die, if need be, for France and the Emperor; but Napoleon did not get the grand army by the might of his fists. He won men by championing their cause, by dazzling their imaginations and winning their hearts.

Physical force alone is inadequate to preserve our institutions. Its use is unnecessary and usually harmful. Once men believed that Christian faith could only be preserved in the last resort by violence. The dungeon, rack and stake were used to protect the faith and preserve the church. Today in America the church still survives and flourishes without reliance on force. There probably was never an age when Christian belief was so widespread and vital. Likewise the family has survived, held together by affection. We no longer force unwilling women into the marriage bond, and the rod is little used on the child.

Altruism is as ancient in the history of even pre-human life as selfishness. Kropotkin has shown in his "Mutual Aid" that the popular misconstruction of the doctrine of the survival of the fittest is far from scientific. It does not mean the survival of the most selfish or most brutal or even the strongest physically. God is not always on the side of the heaviest battalions. We have learned to train men to courses of conduct within limited areas controlled by altruistic motives.

Parents give themselves for their children; patriots die for their country. Tradition, history, literature, monuments, public ceremonies and celebrations glorify the deed, praise the heroism, and perpetuate the motive. A similar all-pervasive education enjoining the practice of universal brotherhood, calling out in us and trusting in others a code of unselfish honor in all personal and international relations, would produce a Christian universalism as reliable as the basis of social institutions as is nationalistic patriotism; and as far above it as modern patriotism is above the tribal clannishness of ancient Scotland or Israel.

We believe there is ample basis in history, as well as in the science of life, for belief in the sufficiency of the higher forces, justice, sympathy, kindness, love and faith, to provide for all that we value in our present social order. When the American Union was formed, the States, "in order to provide for the common defence and to promote the general welfare," disarmed against each other. Succeeding generations, trained to recognize common obligations throughout the Union and to trust the processes of justice, have found these far more effective in making life, person and property secure than the armed peace of the medieval barons or the individual preparedness of the Western frontier. Women and children who form the great bulk of human society are, from the point of view of physical force, employed for their protection, quite helpless. Yet women and children are quite safe in any society, where the appeal of their winsomeness and need is sufficient to arouse respect, chivalry or pity. It is only in war time, when force is invoked for their ostensible protection, that women and children suffer wholesale violence, when the force fails, as it did in Belgium and in France.

We should equip ourselves as a nation to deal with the problems of international relations, not by the use or threat of force, but by the agencies of helpfulness and good-will. We ought to have a Secretary of Peace in the Cabinet to direct such work as the sanitation of Havana, Vera Cruz, Panama and the Panama Canal; and to help less favored countries like Haiti with their finances and elections. Under him should be a force of workers as effective as the army, but as inoffensive to the pride and liberties of other peoples as the Red Cross. They should be engineers, financial experts, administrators, teachers, missionaries, editors, physicians, nurses and statesmen. The Secretary of Peace should have direction of the Red Cross. The American consuls and diplomats should report to him all cases of need in other nations and all other conditions that threaten the internal peace and welfare of less favored nations, or which might involve us in conflict with other peoples. He would then use the forces at his disposal in a way to help the needy peoples without any such suspicion of aggression or evil designs against their rights, territory or sovereignty on our part as the presence of soldiers excites.

While waiting for such a provision in our government for the use of good-will as an agent of national self-protection and neighborly helpfulness, we must rely on the voluntary work of men of good-will among us. We must call for the services of the missionary and educator. If a mere handful of our choicest young men and women, compared to the number a war would call for, would not wait for the call of a limited and militant patriotism in case of war, but would volunteer at the call of Christ in response to the deep needs of such countries as Mexico and Japan, it would do more than an army to make us secure from danger; and if our people at home were willing to support these volunteers with a tithe of what they would give in case of war, and if in addition they would treat the inhabitants of these countries with Christian courtesy and impartial good-will, the danger of war with these countries would disappear forever.

A part of the people of the United States have intrusted the Society of Friends with the distribution of their gifts of mercy to the underfed children of Germany, Austria and Poland. The work is making the name "America" a talisman with which to conjure up in the hearts of the coming generation of Germans feelings of friendship rather than of hate. Recently one of the workers came upon a group of German children holding United States flags. Recognizing him they waved the flags, shouting, "Uncle Sam is our uncle, too!" They will cherish no desire for revenge against America, for in their case we have effectively overcome evil with good.

*A statement issued by the Friends' Peace Committee.

Communism and Christianism:

ANALYZED and contrasted from the Marxian and Darwinian points of view. By William Montgomery Brown, D.D. The writer, a Bishop in the Episcopal Church, smites supernaturalism in religion and capitalism in politics.

Comments: "One of the most extraordinary and annihilating books I have ever read. It will shake the country." "I call it a sermon. The text is astounding: Banish the gods from the sky and capitalism from the earth." "It came like a meteor across a dark sky and it held me tight." "Bishop Brown is the reincarnation of Thomas Paine and his book is the modern Age of Reason." "It will do a wonderful work in this the greatest crisis in all history." "A remarkable book by a remarkable man of intense interest to all."

Published in October, 1920. Fiftieth Thousand now ready, 223 pages; cloth $1.00; paper, 25c or six copies $1.00, postpaid.

THE BRADFORD-BROWN EDUCATIONAL COMPANY, Inc., *Publishers*
168 South Union Street GALION, OHIO

out of your troubles. It is they who will find a way to pull the world out of 'this bad hole that it is in' and set it rejoicing on its way to peace and freedom. Take heart, then, brothers, and join, all of you who care to see a better day, with the women who are bending their energies patiently and steadfastly to make this beautiful world a fit dwelling place, socially, morally and spiritually, for the children of God!"

And somewhere I am inclined to think that you will agree with a good deal of what I have written!

Brookline, Mass. LYDIA G. WENTWORTH.

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM—DOMESTIC

COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 231
ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

Subscribe for and read UNITY—
Do not miss a single number!

UNITY is a weekly paper which for forty-two years, under the editorship of Jenkin Lloyd Jones, upheld the fundamental principles of religion, political economy, and social relations; and this policy is maintained under the new editors, John Haynes Holmes and Francis Neilson. During the War UNITY was steadfast to the cause of righteousness and good will among the peoples of the earth. It has constantly dealt with the grave economic and political problems of Europe and the rest of the world in a straightforward unflinching manner, and it has from time to time published information of deep interest to its readers with which no other paper in the United States has dealt. It is non-sectarian. It advocates free religion and equal opportunity, as the means of uniting all peoples in the bonds of fellowship and amity. UNITY seeks to direct the minds of its readers to all that is best in the world of thought as expressed in the literature of the day, and its literary reviews are not the least valuable part of the several departments which its staff conducts from week to week. There are men and women of international renown writing for its columns and its subscribers are to be found in all the important countries of the world.

If these principles appeal to you, will you not subscribe and interest your friends?

- - - -